Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) – Guildford town centre masterplan, consultation draft, December 2011

All public authorities are required by the Equalities Act 2010 to specifically consider the likely impact of their policy, procedure or practice on certain groups in the society. These groups (sometimes referred to as equality stands) are defined by the 2010 Act as :

- Age
- Disability
- Gender (sex)
- Race
- Sexual Orientation
- Religion or belief
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity

It is our responsibility to ensure that our policies, procedures and service delivery do not discriminate, including indirectly, on any sector of society. Council policies, procedures and service delivery may have differential impacts on certain groups, and these will be highlighted in the EqIA screening. Likely differential impacts must be highlighted, and described, as some may be positive.

Where likely significant adverse differential impacts are identified, consideration should be given to opportunities to reduce or mitigate this through a full equalities impact assessment.

Equality Impact Assessment Screening

Section Planning Services		Officer response screening/sco		Tanya Mankoo-Flatt, Principal Planning Policy Officer		
Name of Policy to be assessed	Guildford town centre masterplan, consultation draft	Date of Assessment	1.12.2011	Is this a proposed new or existing policy/procedure/practice?	Yes The masterplan makes recommendations for future new policy (suitable uses for sites, primary shopping area, new shopping frontages, etc) and practice to be implemented by future statutory plans such as the future Local Plan (through the Core Strategy and other documents of the Local Development Framework). It also advises where further studies will be undertaken. These potential allocations and designations would need to be included in a statutory council plan to constitute a new policy.	
	be the aims, objectives and e policy/procedure/practice?	The masterplan is a strategy that will help to shape how our town centre will look, function, perform and prosper over the next 18 years, to 2030.				

	On adoption by the Council, the masterplan will be a material consideration in determining planning applications. The suggested uses for sites will be given appropriate weight in pre-application advice and in determining planning applications. It will not have statutory status as part of our Local Development Framework (LDF). The existing site allocations in the Local Plan 2003 will remain following adoption of the masterplan. In considering development proposals for particular sites, these allocations, with their development plan status will be weighed against the masterplan as an adopted Council strategy based on more up-to-date government policy and evidence studies. Existing planning and development briefs for town centre sites are not superseded by the masterplan. The masterplan does however indicate where existing briefs are programmed to be revised.
2. Are there any associated or specific objectives of the policy/procedure/practice? Please explain.	 The objectives of the draft town centre masterplan are as follows - Objective 1- To support and expand the town centre economy, including the evening economy and its contribution to the area, broadening the range of jobs Objective 2 - To increase the town centre's retail offer in appropriate locations with a variety of shop sizes to maintain its retail and service centre role Objective 3 - To improve streets and transport, making it easier, safer and more pleasant to move around and through the town centre Objective 4 - To ensure that new development supports the area's infrastructure, including minimising flood risk Objective 5 - To improve the quality of the environment through redevelopment and street improvements, creating well designed buildings and spaces that complement the protected historic buildings

	Objective 6 – To improve the town centre as a sustainable place to live and increase the number of homes, including affordable homes
	Objective 7 – To enhance the appearance and use of the riverside, including improved riverside boundaries and paths
3. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way?	 Those currently living, working, running businesses, shopping, and visiting Guildford town centre, and those who will between now and 2030. People living in the shopping catchment area will have a greater number and range of shops available locally. The local economy will be enhanced by the creation of more jobs People living in and visiting the town centre for leisure and recreation will enjoy enhanced riverside and historic streets More homes may be created on identified sites and above shops
4. What outcomes are wanted from this policy / procedures / practice?	 Additional town centre jobs. New homes (private and affordable) Improved shopping facilities in the town centre enhancing and strengthening the town centre and its contribution to Guildford's economy. Improvements to the appearance of the area. Easier and safer to move around and across the town centre by cycle, on foot and by car. Making better use of underused important sites and some dated and poor quality buildings.
5. What factors / forces could contribute / detract from the outcomes?	 See section 4 above for contributions to outcome Potential detractors - Lack of statutory status Lack of traffic modelling at this stage for potential redevelopment sites The economic cycle – sites may not come forward for development when the economy is in decline.
6. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	People currently living, working, running businesses, shopping, and visiting Guildford town centre, and those who will between now and 2030. Landowners with in the town centre.
7. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy?	Guildford Borough Council is responsible for the masterplan, and will be formally adopting it. To be implemented by Guildford Borough Council with its partners, Surrey County Council as

	the Highway Authority, the National Trust, and other land owners.
8. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to age?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	 A proposed town centre supermarket may be accessed without use of a car or public transport. More places to site and relax, including a new public square. Pedestrian and cycle facilities will be improved. The redevelopment of the identified sites, some for retail development, will provide a range of jobs.
9. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to disability?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Redeveloped sites, new bridges and improvements to the pedestrian environments will need to be designed to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act. Improvements to street and public spaces will improve the environment for all, including people with a variety of disabilities.
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Employment opportunities and improvements to development sites and to the wider environment should benefit men and women equally.
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on racial groups?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to sexual orientation?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above

13. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to religion or belief?	Νο
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to gender reassignment?	Νο
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to marriage and civil partnership?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact due to pregnancy and maternity?	No
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
17. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on former offenders?	No
(considering the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974)	
What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
18. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on those with dependants/caring responsibilities?	No

What existing evidence (either presumed otherwise) do you have for this?	or	The masterplan is for the equal benefit of all those mentioned in Section 3 above
17. Could the differential impact identified in 8-18 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy/procedure/practice?	No	
18. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group?	N/A	
Or any other reason?		
19. Is there any concern that there are unmet needs in relation to any of the above groups?	No	
20. Does differential impact or unmet need cut across the equality strands (e.g. elder BME groups)?	No	
21. If yes, should the full EIA be conducted jointly with another service area/contractor/partner/agency?	N/A	

24. If No, are there any changes	N	0 No.			0		0	0
				age and Civil Irtnership		ancy and ternity	Total Impact	
		0		0	0	0	0	0
		Total Impact Score :0-8 pointslow adverse impact, no need for full EIA9-17 pointsmedium adverse impact, full EIA required18-24 pointshigh adverse impact, full EIA requiredAgeDisabilityGender (sex)RaceSexual OrientationReligion or Belief						
23. Should the policy proceed to a full equality impact assessment?	No	Impact on each group to score : 0 – no relevance, no adverse impact, or positive impact 1 – extremely low relevance and adverse impact 2 – relatively low relevance and adverse impact 3 – medium relevance and adverse impact 4 - relatively high relevance and adverse impact						
22. Is there a missed opportunity to improve your business in relation to any of the policies, procedures or practices to promote racial, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief equality?	No							

required to the policy to impro around the equality agenda?	ove it			
Signed (completing officer)	Tanya Mankoo-Flatt	Date	6/12/11	

(completing officer)	Tanya Marikoo-Fran	Dale	0/12/11
Signed (Head of Section)	Tracey Haskins	Date	6 /12/11
Countersigned (member of Equality Action Grou	Ip) Sarah-Jane Willmott	Date	6 /12/11